



Applicant	:	Liang et al.
Appl. No.	:	09/919,758
Filed	:	July 31, 2001
For	:	METHOD FOR GENERATING TRANSCRIPTIONALLY ACTIVE DNA FRAGMENTS
Examiner	:	Strzeleka, T.

M. T. Morley (Date)
Marc T. Morley, Reg. No. 52,051

Examiner : Strzeleka, T.

RECEIVED
MAR 03 2003
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

- (X) Response to Restriction Requirement.
- (X) Return prepaid postcard.
- (X) The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 11-1410.

-1-



GTSYS.003C1

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Liang et al.

Appl. No. : 09/919,758

Filed : July 31, 2001

For : METHOD FOR GENERATING
TRANSCRIPTIONALLY
ACTIVE DNA FRAGMENTS

Examiner : Strzeleka, T.

) Group Art Unit: 1637

) I hereby certify that this correspondence and all
) marked attachments are being deposited with the
) United States Postal Service as first-class mail in
) an envelope addressed to: Assistant
) Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C.
) 20231, on

) February 21, 2003

) *M. T. Morley* (Date)
) Marc T. Morley, Reg. No. 52,051

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 2327
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action of January 23, 2002, Applicants hereby submit the following provisional election and response to the restriction requirement.

REMARKS

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants hereby provisionally elect to prosecute the invention set forth in Group III, Claims 21-29 and 38-45, in this application. This provisional election is made with traverse. In the event that the Patent Office maintains the Restriction Requirement, Applicants reserve the right to prosecute Claims 1-3, 5-20, and 30-37 in divisional applications under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 121.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement. Specifically, Applicants request withdrawal of the restriction between Groups I-III and examination of the claims of Groups I-III together. The Office justified the restriction requirement by concluding that the inventions of Groups I-III are unrelated because allegedly they are drawn to methods with different starting materials, method steps and goals. Respectfully, this conclusion is incorrect and is unsupported.

RECEIVED
MAR 03 2003
TECH CENTER 1600/2900